

**The Virginia Indigent Defense Commission  
Commission Meeting  
Founders Inn  
5641 Indian River Road  
Virginia Beach, Virginia, 23464  
April 7, 2008**

Professor Robert Shepherd called the meeting to order at 12:30pm. Commission members in attendance were Judge Alan Rosenblatt, Judge Edward Hanson, Chris Anderson, David Lett, Maria Jankowski, David Walker, Carmen Williams, James Towey, and Steve Benjamin. Administrative staff included Executive Director, David Johnson; Deputy Director, DJ Geiger, and Diane Pearson. Jerry Gentile with the Department of Planning and Budget was also in attendance.

Quorum requirements have been met.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the agenda.

Mr. Lett seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

Mr. Johnson mentioned that Jay Underwood who passed away recently was the first Public Defender in the Portsmouth office and gave twenty two years of service. We have dedicated this conference to Jay and there is a framed copy of the dedication that was written by Jay's office at the registration table. There is also a memory book that we invite everyone to sign. We are going to give the book and the framed dedication to his widow, Fran.

The next item on the agenda is the minutes from the November 29, 2007 meeting.

Judge Hanson moved to waive the reading and approve the minutes.

Judge Rosenblatt seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

The next order of business is the report by the Department of Planning and Budget.

Mr. Johnson introduced Jerry Gentile of the Department of Planning and Budget, Best Practices Division.

Mr. Gentile reported that he has been in his position since 1999 and has reviewed and done organizational analyses for many agencies. The bottom line is the Virginia Indigent Defense Commission is a very healthy agency, overall. He was surprised that the Commission came to him for help as most agencies do not volunteer for the analysis done by his division.

He had four points to make.

1. The most critical need or concern that his department found was in the finance area, and he believes it has a lot to do with the growth that the agency has shown in the last few years. Your budget is close to \$40 million, you also have several offices that have opened in the past few years, there has been a pay increase that, as he understands, is bearing fruit already, and your applicant pool is getting bigger and deeper. There is one office that has a full compliment of attorneys for the first time in their history and they believe it is due to the pay increase.

He went on to say there is a lot of commitment from the Commonwealth to the agency. He thinks that the agency is in good shape but that it's akin to a big body that doesn't know how to maneuver itself yet, kind of an awkward teenager and just needs to mature.

The finance area needs a higher skill level to deal with the financial commitments and obligations that an agency this size needs.

2. The second area is Human Resources (HR). The standard in the state is one HR staff for one hundred personnel, you have 540 employees and as I understand, you have two HR staffers so you are pretty deficient in that area and no matter how good they are, they just can't do the work. Plus your turnover rate has really added a lot to their workload.

He added that regarding the turnover rate which is very high for an agency of your size, it has not impacted the morale of the staff. You have a very good agency and very motivated people, from attorneys on down. Everyone was extremely helpful to us.

3. The third point was the IT staff. Kudos. He wasn't sure how they do what they do, but they do it and they do it well. Everybody had great things to say about the IT department. They are just stretched thin. There is no way they can maintain this level of consistency and keep up with the load that they have. You need to address this very soon with more staff for the IT department or added use of consultants. Also you're missing out on a lot of things that could save you money. The first thing would be a replacement cycle for your computers. Rather than to replace a thousand or so computers at one time because they are the same age, putting them in a five year or so replacement cycle actually saves money in the long run.
4. The last point is for the Administrative office. There were very strong feelings for Mr. Johnson and Ms. Geiger of where they are taking the agency. Some people have problems in that they don't get to see them enough which is almost impossible. They know what direction they are taking the agency and are willing to support that direction. So it's very positive feedback that we got from the staff.

He concluded by saying that on behalf of his staff, they have done a lot of reports on Commissions and Boards and this is probably the most engaged Board they have ever had.

He went on to say that when we interview Boards, they don't know the ins and outs. You know your stuff. We interviewed several Commission Members and you know the ins and outs, you knew the problems before we did, what areas were deficient in your agency. That is very encouraging. You are

very up on your game, you know the issues, and not only the issue of public indigent defense but also how the agency is run and maintained.

All in all, the agency is very healthy except for some of the areas that we just went over and can improve. He doesn't see any indication that it's a dying agency. The agency has a direction and a goal and is focused and you just need the right staff in those key areas.

He thanked everyone for their time and effort. He mentioned that Mr. Johnson will go over the report in detail. He said it was a pleasure to work with everyone.

Professor Shepherd said that on behalf of the Commission he would like to thank Mr. Gentile and his staff for an outstanding job. He was highly impressed with their professionalism and interest in the work of the Commission. We especially appreciate your words of appreciation for the commitment that the Commission Members have to the work of indigent defense in Virginia. That is probably the best compliment you could pay us.

Mr. Benjamin commended Mr. Johnson and Ms. Geiger for obviously a glowing report.

**Judge Hanson moved that the Virginia Indigent Defense Commission convene in closed session to discuss personnel issues pursuant to the personnel exemption contained in §2.2-3711(A) (1) of the code of Virginia.**

**This meeting will be attended only by members of the Commission however, pursuant to §2.2-37(12) (F) of the code of Virginia, the Commission also requests the attendance of the Executive Director, David Johnson and the Deputy Executive Director, DJ Geiger because it is reasonable to believe that their presence will aid the Commission in its consideration of the matters which are the subjects of the closed session.**

Judge Rosenblatt seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

The meeting reconvened at 1:35 pm.

**Judge Hanson moved for a roll call vote asking that each member certify that to the best of his or her knowledge, during the closed session, the Commission heard, discussed, or considered only public business matters that were lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Freedom of Information Act and were identified in the motion by which the closed session was convened.**

All members so certified.

Mr. Johnson reported that the Auditor of Public Accounts recommended that we get a thorough analysis of our administrative structure, which we did. The report contains a list of issues along with recommendations. The Personnel Committee met and advised the Executive Director to follow the recommendations subject to financial limitations. More specifically the Personnel Committee suggested that Mr. Johnson prioritize them and follow them.

Through a power point presentation he showed the Commission members what the report recommended. He added that we also received several commendations. The purpose of the report was to take everything into account; we needed to evaluate everything. They had some specific recommendations. One of the recommendations was to post the meeting minutes on our website. We've updated our website and have posted the minutes. Part of the problem that they didn't understand is that we can't post the minutes until they have been approved. One thing we will start doing is getting a summary of the actions taken during the Commission meeting out to the Public Defenders and anyone in the Administrative office who might be interested.

Mr. Johnson added that we are now holding monthly staff meetings. We thought we were over doing it so we cut back, but apparently we cut back too much. We are now meeting on a monthly schedule.

The big piece was the financial operations. Basically we just didn't have the skill set to give us the information we needed to react to sophisticated budgeting issues. We addressed the issue by eliminating the fiscal director position and are in the process of looking for a new upgraded position of Director of Budget and Finance.

Rebecca Norris who is our part time Lease Administrator is unbelievably productive. She does the work of a full time person. Logically, her position would have fallen under the fiscal section. When we get our new upgraded position filled, we will put the Lease Administrator under the fiscal section.

Our second biggest need is a Human Resource Manager. We have two parts to our HR department. We have Danita Pryor who handles all the paper work that deals with the hiring and firing. It is a very labor intensive position and Danita does a very good job. The other half of HR is Nancy Greer who handles benefits. That is our HR department. With a 540 person agency we have a lot of HR issues and legal issues. In the report there are eight recommendations in terms of what we should do with HR.

There was discussion regarding the salary of an HR director and the duties of that position.

Mr. Johnson reported that our training department received really high marks. Our new training facility is constantly in use. We do certification trainings every month. We had our first trial skills workshop where we had a day-long training. We're doing these trainings in a very cost-effective manner.

Ms. Geiger added that in the report, the recommendations for technology will help in all of these other areas, fiscal, training, human resources, to do our every day operations more efficiently and quickly.

Mr. Johnson said that technology will help with our communications. This report was a very good thing for us. We've needed it for a long time. It made us look at the way we are doing things, and we would like to do everything that it recommends. The Personnel Committee advised us to prioritize and we're asking for instruction from the Commission for a recommendation on the report.

Judge Hanson made a motion for the Executive Director to prioritize and implement the recommendations listed in the Department of Planning and Budget Best Management Practices Report, taking into account budgetary constraints.

Mr. Walker seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

The next item on the agenda is the severance procedure policy.

Mr. Johnson reported that this came about when the agency had some severance issues in the past. He said that he spoke with Mr. Guy Horsley in the Attorney General's Office regarding their policy. This severance policy tracks pretty much the same thing that they do. In addition to this, employees get compensated for any unused annual leave they have accumulated.

The policy is necessary if there are any across the board cuts or if a position is eliminated, in other words, it's not termination for cause.

There was discussion about how much leave can be carried over each year.

Judge Hanson made a motion to adopt the severance procedures policy.

Mr. Anderson seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

The next item on the agenda is the budget report.

The public defenders are in the process of giving us their input for their budgets.

Mr. Johnson said it appears we will finish the year with \$2,728,000 left over. To put that in context, our budget is near \$40 million. We changed the salary structure in November and that has slowed our turnover and vacancy. We did get twenty-six new positions July 1<sup>st</sup>, which were gradually filled over six months. We are always going to have money generated from turnover and vacancies.

We have some proposed items of what we would like to do with this money before the end of the fiscal year. The biggest piece is IT computers. We need to get on a replacement schedule. All of our computer equipment is now off warranty and is starting to go and every time it goes, it's very expensive to fix.

The biggest expenditure is to replace the desktops. FY08 would be what we're looking at and is \$645,000 which is 550 computers. We also need to replace our field servers which are important to keep in compliance with the VITA standards and something we can replace now. We need to replace printers. The network switch is something we need also to keep in compliance with VITA.

We are being required to have comprehensive plans to protect our data in the event of an emergency, natural disaster, fire, or flood. This is about \$16,000 and basically the plan calls for us to have twelve laptops, the server, the switch, and one printer to keep in the administrative office. Because we have everyone's information backed up off site, if an office goes down we can load these computers with all their data, get them to the field office, and get them back up and running.

We went through this recently when an office was struck by lightning, another office has flooded twice.

There was discussion about being at the ready with equipment and supplies and the efficiency of the IT Department.

Mr. Johnson reported that all of the telephone systems have been replaced except for Martinsville. The office was going to move but is now being renovated so they won't be moving and we need to replace their phone system. Our voice mail systems are old and beginning to have major problems. Every time one goes, because they are out of warranty, it costs around \$3,000 to \$4,000 to replace. We want to replace them now and get them under warranty with the technical assistance to do all this.

Mr. Johnson continued to say that the caseload study is progressing nicely. One of the side benefits from the caseload study is improvement in capturing data. We are constantly being asked for data by other agencies, the Supreme Court, the General Assembly. We have a hard time getting the information we need and part of that will be addressed by the programming we need to have done for the caseload study, allowing us to better utilize our technology.

He reported that we have had problems in the administrative office complex with theft. In our office we have had some small electronics disappear. We have a lot of valuable equipment and what we want to do is use \$1600 of this money to purchase secure locking cabinets.

Ms. Geiger added that Item 12 in the report is a recommendation that you will see in the report from DPB. It's one of the technology recommendations that help the financial side of things.

Mr. Johnson said that Item 15 is the security system that we talked about in conjunction with our receptionist position.

Item 16. Martinsville had a flood many years ago and they have a basement full of old files that are moldy and a health hazard. We need to contract with someone to go down there, go through all of the files, and extract all the file names and numbers. The files are old enough that we will not have to keep them but they will need to be shredded. The figure in the report is high, it will probably not cost that much but it is something we need to take care of soon.

Item 17 is the I-9 Compliance Project. Every time an employee is hired an I-9 form needs to be filled out. They did an audit and 22 out of 26 were filled out wrong. The problem is you can get fined up to \$1500 for everyone that isn't done correctly. We need to go through all of the I-9's and do them correctly.

There was discussion about the I-9 forms, the HR person is responsible for filling them out and they need to be stored in a central location which would be the administrative office.

Ms. Geiger added that all of the agencies took a hit on this. The new form came out in 2007 with no training. The Department of Accounts has now put together a power point presentation on how to actually fill them out. There is an instruction booklet forty-six pages long on how to properly fill out the form.

Mr. Johnson added that Ms. Geiger is looking into the I-9 training that is being offered and will get it to all of our office managers to make sure they understand how to fill them out.

Mr. Johnson continued with ARMICS Stage 2 which is mostly transactional and fiscal. Ms. Still was going to be the person doing most of the Stage 2 work but as you know, she is no longer with the agency. This left us in a really bad position because it is very complex. Ms. Geiger spoke with Ron Necessary with the Department of Accounts who is in charge of all of this. Mr. Necessary gave her the name of Millie Sauer who is a former Department of Accounts employee who has done ARMICS for two other agencies and will help us. Mr. Necessary granted us an extension until June to get the project completed.

Mr. Johnson added that because of Ms. Sauer's retirement salary restrictions this project will cost a lot less than anticipated.

Mr. Johnson said that we will finish the year with around \$1.5 million and out of a \$39 million budget with our turnover and vacancy that is great progress.

Judge Hanson made a motion to give the Executive Director approval to expend funds to purchase items presented in the Budget Report prior to the end of the fiscal year.

Judge Rosenblatt seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

There was discussion about filling the new, upgraded fiscal position and when that will happen. Mr. Johnson reported that an ad for that position has not yet been run but hopefully we will have someone by summer.

The projects update was the next item on the agenda.

Ms. Geiger reported that we have a chart that we update regularly. During the General Assembly Session, as you know, we only had one bill that we introduced this year. We introduced the bill in the House and the Senate. Delegate Griffith was our patron in the House and Senator Hurt was our patron in the Senate. The reason that we chose them is because both of them were involved in this issue when it was first introduced two years ago. This basically removes the sunset provision which would have ended the requirement that courts notify us when they appoint off the list for court appointed counsel.

We have been using the forms we receive from the courts to try to recruit the attorneys onto the court appointed list. That has worked in some localities better than in others, but we have seen a few more juvenile attorneys join the court appointed list.

Just as an aside, Senator Hurt contacted us Friday to see how he could get on the court appointed list.

Ms. Geiger added that House Bill 93 and Senate Bill 634 are the bills allowing localities to supplement compensation to Public Defender offices. When it was introduced it contained the same language that is used for supplements to Commonwealth Attorney offices. Because our structure is completely different there were some amendments that we felt needed to be added. We provided information and amendments but felt like we couldn't really take a hard line in opposition to the bill. It was a very awkward position for us to argue against since no one, Republican or Democrat, Commonwealth Attorney friendly or not, had a problem with this issue. Everyone was ready to vote for it, the only

concern they had was whether it was going to cost the state money. Once that was answered, no one had a problem with it.

Both of those bills were passed.

Mr. Johnson added that this is an issue that has raised the passions of the Public Defenders. He has talked with several, especially in places like Martinsville and Danville who are really upset about this because they can't attract lawyers now and have no hope of getting supplements. They feel like it's going to be a two-tiered system of justice and now they are going to be competing with other Public Defender offices.

There was discussion about the Public Defenders and their reactions to this. It is very complicated especially for offices that work in several jurisdictions.

Ms. Geiger went on with Senate Bill 369. The VBA had come to you and asked for support on a very broad bill that would have allowed ex parte hearings for expert witnesses in any case. The VBA could not find a patron to agree to put that in for them, so they narrowed it a bit to include only capital cases. Senator Watkins and Senator McDougale introduced the bills. Senator McDougale rolled his bill into Senator Watkins' and it passed the Senate pretty much along party lines, except for Senator McDougale. The bill was carried over for the year in the House.

She thinks the VBA, the Fair Trial Project and a few others are going to come up with some strategies. The question is whether the House will hold a meeting before the deadline in December, as to whether the bill survives until next session or if it dies.

Professor Shepherd commended Capital Defender, Joe Flood for an outstanding job on his presentation on this bill before the House committee during the General Assembly.

The next item on the agenda is training and what we have planned for FY08-09. Mr. Johnson reported that this is a very aggressive schedule of certification trainings and that we now have a partnership with the Alexandria Law Library where they do the replays for us at the same time so we have an additional part of the state that is routinely being covered.

We had our first trial advocacy workshop which was a big success. The lawyers who came really liked it. We had some judges and lawyers spend the day in a workshop format and we're going to continue that.

The lunch time lecture series has been going quite well also. We have some really good recording equipment for the DCJS. Carlos is able to add music and credits in the beginning and they're getting better and better. This also allows us to do some trainings in-house, even trainings like I-9 training.

Mr. Johnson added that two of the certification trainings we did were for lawyers at McGuire Woods. We did those live. They're doing pro bono cases now, accepting misdemeanor overflow cases in Manchester Courthouse. We certified twelve lawyers from McGuire Woods to do indigent defense work. This was somewhat of a pilot program for them. The good news for McGuire Woods is that they've gotten their management to agree to give their associates billable hour credit for doing pro bono indigent defense work, which is a huge break through.



Our commitment to the pro bono program is that we certify the attorneys, offer some mentoring, and we introduce them to the judges.

Mr. Johnson said the training DVD's will be available for anyone who wants them. We can make a lot of DVD's now so we're sending them out to all of the PD offices. They will have libraries in their offices on all the one hour lectures.

Mr. Johnson reported that David Baugh started as the Capital Defender in Richmond on March 1<sup>st</sup>. Claire Cardwell did a very nice job for us. The office had four cases pending, David talked with all of the prosecutors and, as a result, two of the cases were nol-prossed.

Just to clarify the next Commission meeting is June 12<sup>th</sup> not the 19<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Geiger reported that we're nearing the end of Phase II of the Caseload Study which was the time study. This is the piece under the budget that we're going to be spending some money for the case information system. Changes to PDCIS will allow us to capture the data going forward, but also to ensure that the data that was captured in November is the same and can be compared to previous years for the purposes of the caseload study.

We hope to bring the advisory committee in during the week of June 9<sup>th</sup> to review the report on Phase II, and to prepare for Phase III. We're on track for the schedule they gave us. They have been very easy to work with, and we have been trading information with them. Mr. Ernouf is working with them to make sure the data withstands the challenges that may come out, to get it as clean as we can get it.

Mr. Johnson added that when we did the time study, they went through our offices for thirty days. They said it was the best compliance rate they've ever had. It was above ninety five percent. The Public Defenders did a good job of talking to their staff and their lawyers saying that for this to be a meaningful project it has to be real data.

Ms. Geiger added that the compliance rate was very good but the data was good too.

Ms. Geiger continued with ARMICS. The Phase II extension was granted, which is until June 30<sup>th</sup>. Phase II requires that every transactional process or operation that you do is audited and tested to ensure that they work properly. If you find problems, then for Phase III you have to come up with a plan of correction. The Phase III deadline is June 30, 2008. However, we will have to get an extension because we got an extension on Phase II.

Millie Sauer is going to start with us April 14<sup>th</sup>. She is the consultant. She's done Phase II for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor, so she is well versed in it. She said that the time it took her in the first agency was about 330 hours and the second was about 250. She expects it to take somewhere between that range or less. We expect that she will be done by June, maybe mid June.

Ms. Geiger went on to the Vita Standards. The Vita and APA security requirements are for IT. We've been meeting, as required, weekly. Mr. Ernouf is running the meetings with the directors and Rebecca Norris. Ms. Norris is also helping him with the emergency plans that Mr. Johnson mentioned earlier. It's called the Continuity of Operations Plan, which covers the IT information but it also covers physical plant

facilities; what happens, where do you go. For each individual office and satellite office we have to have a plan of action. They have developed plans and a template and we're filling that in.

Mr. Johnson added that the way that works is, for instance, if the Richmond Public Defender Office can't get into their building, they will come to our office and use our training facility. We will set them up and get them running. There is a whole detailed plan of action of how you communicate with your clients. Each office has to have an individualized plan for their jurisdiction. A broader issue would be if it was a state-wide disaster.

Mr. Ernouf is working on getting us into compliance with all of the standards. It's a major, time-consuming project. We have to get waivers on certain things for which we don't have the technology yet or enough staff. This is another of those unfunded mandates that we are doing the best that we can with, and at the back end of a much painful process we are going to be a much better system.

The states that have disaster plans in place are the states that have already had a major disaster. Things completely fell apart, and then they put a plan in place. We're ahead of the curve because we're putting it in place now.

With the basic data stored off-site we will be able to recreate the docket and basic case information. We'll be able to get that to them within twenty-four hours.

Ms. Geiger added that one of the security requirements is that you provide training for all of your employees on IT security. VITA has put together a training and has uploaded it to the Knowledge Center.

It is a tool that DHRM has set up. Each agency can have its own work area and you can load training, policies and procedures, notes and announcements, etc. to its employees and the public. It basically works as an intranet.

We will be online with this July 1, 2008.

Ms. Geiger went on to the final project, which is the strategic plan. We will try to get our strategic working group together in May. The disaster plan is actually a part of the strategic plan. The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis that we have to do and is also related to IT is part of that plan. The Department of Aging report is part of the plan. The service area plans and the annual progress report are all a part of strategic planning now.

We already have our first version of our strategic plan in the VA Performs System, so this shouldn't be as intensive as last year's, but there are still a lot of pieces that need to be put together.

The next item on the agenda is other business.

Mr. Johnson said we still have this issue of paying for case related expenses which comes up most often in the Capital Defender offices. The problem is that there are things they want, that the court just isn't going to pay. The Commission policy has been that we will reimburse if they have a court order that says the court will reimburse for this. We reimburse the employee right then so the employee doesn't have to wait until the end of the case to get their money back. I think maybe what we need is a clear,

definitive answer from the Commission that if it's a case related expense, it is supposed to be paid for by the court, and our budget is not set up to include court reimbursed case-related expenses.

There was discussion about how to handle the situation. Mr. Benjamin suggested to articulate the clear policy of the Commission, but tell them we are aware that the question keeps coming up and the Commission will consider a re-evaluation of the position. Invite them to make their best case to the Commission as to why the current state of the law and our policy is not adequate. Other than broad, general requests, he sees no reason to even reconsider the policy.

There was discussion about whether we should ask for an appropriation of money for a particular item.

Mr. Benjamin said there is another area that he would like to see our public defender system embrace as a form of specialized knowledge and expertise which is the area of forensic science. Other states have forensic science expertise within their public defender systems. He would like for Mr. Johnson and Ms. Geiger to begin considering the feasibility of doing the same thing in our system. Mr. Benjamin thinks our system is lagging quite substantially behind, to our clients' detriment. What he has in mind is a dedicated public defender with specialized knowledge in forensic science who would probably be located in the central office. They would serve primarily two functions. One function would be as a possible second chair in cases that had particular involvement with forensic science or expert testimony. The second function would be to serve as a resource in a number of different areas, for instance they would be available to assist our public defenders with their motions for expert assistance.

Another role for this specialized public defender could be to assist in specialized discovery requests. He or she could also assist public defenders in determining what testing or analysis can be done in any particular case in order to either rebut the testimony of a Commonwealth expert or to affirmatively introduce evidence in testing that should have been done in a particular case in order to get to the truth of the matter scientifically, as opposed to relying on a snitch. Another category could be to assist the public defenders in their cross examination of the state's experts; if not as a second chair but to assist them, to go over the lab report for example.

Mr. Benjamin said he would like to ask the Commission to give some thought and have staff report back on the feasibility of this.

There was discussion as to at what level this attorney would be hired. It would depend on their expertise in the field and if they had the specialized knowledge they would be at the top tier. If it was someone who had an interest in acquiring this information, who had the potential to learn, then it wouldn't need to be, in the beginning, at the top tier.

Everyone agreed that this was an excellent suggestion.

A suggestion was made that Mr. Johnson and Ms. Geiger explore this for presentation to the Commission at the June meeting.

There was discussion about the possibilities of expanding the Appellate Office. The whole appellate system is something we need to study.

Mr. Benjamin said that he thinks we are going to develop one of the finest public defender systems in the country and sees the forensic science unit as a necessary component of where we are going. He's very proud of the work the public defenders and the Commission are doing. He commended everyone on a great job and is proud to be associated with the Commission and is proud of what we are doing with indigent defense. It is becoming a national success story.

Mr. Johnson said that it could be possible to get back to the Personnel Committee before the June Commission meeting. He also added that Ms. Ortiz in Chesapeake had an opening for a secretary and had 127 applicants and because of the new salary ended up hiring away from the Commonwealth Attorney's office.

He also said that at the General Assembly this year he had the experience of listening to legal aid lobbying for money saying how unfair it was that public defenders make more money and we're stealing their people.

Mr. Johnson explained the loan forgiveness program, the college cost reduction act. It basically means that if you have an \$1100 a month loan payment and you go into public service work, your loan is reduced to \$427 for as long as you are in the job and if you stay in the job for ten years the loan is forgiven.

Professor Shepherd reiterated that the next meeting is June 12<sup>th</sup>.

Judge Hanson moved to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Lett seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50pm

Respectfully Submitted:

Approved By:

---

Diane Z. Pearson, Administrative Assistant

---

David J. Johnson, Executive Director